



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,920	10/22/2003	Donald E. Mosing	FRK-102	6867
21897 7590 10/02/2008 THE MATTHEWS FIRM 2000 BERING DRIVE SUITE 700 HOUSTON, TX 77057				
EXAMINER PATEL, VISHAL A				
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3676				
MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE 10/02/2008 PAPER				

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1  
2  
3 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
5

6  
7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
8 AND INTERFERENCES  
9

10 Ex parte DONALD E. MOSING, DAVID L. SIPOS,  
11 and JEREMY R. ANGELLE  
12

13  
14 Appeal 2008-1174  
15 Application 10/690,920  
16 Technology Center 3600  
17

18  
19 Oral Hearing Held: August 12, 2008  
20  
21

22  
23 Before WILLIAM F. PATE, III, JENNIFER D. BAHR, and JOSEPH A.  
24 FISCHETTI, Administrative Patent Judges  
25

26 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:  
27

28 GUY E. MATTHEWS, ESQUIRE  
29 Matthews, Lawson & Bowick, PLLC  
30 2000 Bering Drive  
31 Suite 700  
32 Houston, TX 77057  
33 (713) 355-4200  
34

35 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, August  
36 12, 2008, commencing at 1:22 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark  
37 Office, 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Hearing Room A, Alexandria,  
38 Virginia, before Lori B. Allen, Notary Public.

PROCEEDINGS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

JUDGE PATE: Is it "Matthew" or "Matthews"?

MR. MATTHEWS: "Matthews."

JUDGE PATE: "Matthews"?

MR. MATTHEWS: Two "T's," one "S."

JUDGE PATE: Okay. Well, we've had a chance to look at this case  
beforehand, and we're up to speed on it. And we'd like to hear your  
arguments concerning patentability.

MR. MATTHEWS: Sure. May I approach?

JUDGE PATE: Yes, you may approach.

MR. MATTHEWS: For the court.

JUDGE PATE: Okay, briefing book. Thank you.

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, sir. And we have one that we'd like to give  
to the clerk, if that's all right.

JUDGE PATE: Yes, you can give her one. I don't know if she'll find  
it necessary.

MR. MATTHEWS: This is a case that involves something in the oil  
field called "casing." Casing is a large OD piece of pipe, from 9-7/8 inches  
to 36 to 40 inches. It is huge. It is the outer shell for enabling the drilling of  
a well onshore or offshore. These things are used offshore. And that's really  
what this invention is about.

When you start off to drill an oil well with casing, you start off with  
anywhere from 20-inch to 40-inch OD thin-wall pipe, which historically you  
welded. It would take four welders. It may take eight hours. The price for

1 an offshore well right now is 450,000 bucks a day, and up. Eight hours is a  
2 big chunk of that.

3 What this invention does -- And this is why this invention meets the  
4 KSR standards. That's why this invention indeed is synergistic. What this  
5 invention does is enable through a quick-connect coupling that's got space  
6 threads, interrupted threads, in a vertical array.

7 The prior art cited is for tubing -- it is not casing, a substantially  
8 different deal -- or for drill pipe. Some drill pipe can be in a quick coupling.  
9 There is no disclosure anywhere in the prior art with respect to the claimed  
10 invention that claims casing in combination with the quick connect in which  
11 you can drive on top of the casing, not score or damage the threads, and in  
12 which the coupling is double-shouldered. You have a pin box, shoulder and  
13 bottom here on the pin, shoulder at the bottom of the box (indicates). You  
14 have a double shoulder that accepts the compressive loads of pile driving on  
15 top of this casing.

16 And what you normally do is drive 300 to 1,000 feet with a pile  
17 driver. It's just a huge thing. The reason the oil is called "crude" is because  
18 that's the way you produce it. Everything is heavy weight, heavy weight,  
19 and trying to turn it in a clockwise direction. You're drilling. That's why we  
20 say, "Turn it to the right." That's the saying in the oil business.

21 So what this invention does is eliminate welding, save substantial  
22 time, enable driving of the casing, and enable you to go ahead and set your  
23 casing. You set the casing in progressive sizes, down only so far. And then  
24 you drill inside the casing with a drill bit and drill byte.

25 All the prior art relates to tubing, or all the prior art relates to drill  
26 pipe. There is no disclosure of any double-shouldered casing -- or drill pipe,

1 either -- that would enable you to drive on top of the tubing or drill  
2 pipe -- which you would never do -- where it would enable you to drive on  
3 top and prevent the threads from scoring; or in other words, in which the  
4 threads don't accept any load.

5 And what you will find is every bit of the prior art -- Wood,  
6 McCaskill, Kamp, and Wilson all have threads that interfere and that accept  
7 load. The threads of the claimed invention -- Well, all the answers are in the  
8 claims. I think it's 1, 23, 37, 51, and 69 -- All are not covered, either singly  
9 or in combination. As a matter of fact, you can't take any of the disclosures  
10 of any of these four patents and fit them with respect to a 103 rejection.

11 JUDGE PATE: Let me go back a minute.

12 MR. MATTHEWS: Sure.

13 JUDGE PATE: You seem to emphasize that none of the references  
14 were casings. They were either drill strain or tubing strain?

15 MR. MATTHEWS: Well, I frankly emphasize it.

16 JUDGE PATE: Well, yes, but the claim -- I'm looking at claim one  
17 here. It doesn't say word-one about casing.

18 MR. MATTHEWS: I know it. But if you'd look at your book, you  
19 have some dependent claims that do.

20 JUDGE BAHR: Well, were they separately argued?

21 MR. MATTHEWS: They probably were, yes, ma'am.

22 JUDGE BAHR: Where?

23 MR. MATTHEWS: Judge, they were.

24 JUDGE BAHR: Where?

25 MR. MATTHEWS: Claim four, 34, 39, 43, and the abstract all refer  
26 to casing. And you'll see in your notebook, with respect to number five, we

1 have some proposed claims in which we've put in casing and taken out pipe.  
2 And that's what we would propose.

3 But I don't believe we properly necessarily did the right emphasis with  
4 respect to what this invention is, because this is a great invention. And I  
5 believe simply calling it a casing -- which the ordinary person skilled in the  
6 art absolutely would know what this is -- would enable the distinguishing  
7 103 characteristics to enable you and us to overcome what the prior art is.

8 JUDGE FISCHETTI: Excuse me, Mr. Matthews?

9 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, sir.

10 JUDGE FISCHETTI: You said "the proposed claims." Have they  
11 been --

12 MR. MATTHEWS: They have not.

13 JUDGE FISCHETTI: -- exhibited to the examiner yet?

14 MR. MATTHEWS: No.

15 JUDGE FISCHETTI: Okay.

16 MR. MATTHEWS: They are before the court.

17 JUDGE PATE: Yes, we don't do anything with proposed claims.

18 MR. MATTHEWS: Okay. Well, here's the other thing. While you're  
19 absolutely correct that the preamble does not refer to casing, there's no  
20 question about the fact, however, that the claims, as they are currently  
21 configured before this board, still do not disclose this combination. They do  
22 not disclose pipe, any kind of pipe -- double-shouldered. They do not  
23 disclose any type of pipe that can take a compressive double-shouldered load  
24 at the end of the pin and at the end of the box.

25 As a matter of fact, they disclose patently distinct claim language with  
26 respect to the prior art, because the prior art requires loaded threads. And

1 these don't require loaded threads. There is no recitation of that whatsoever.

2 As a matter of fact, the claims --

3 JUDGE PATE: Well, the --

4 MR. MATTHEWS: Go ahead.

5 JUDGE PATE: Do the claims preclude loaded thread?

6 MR. MATTHEWS: I believe they do, yes.

7 JUDGE BAHR: Could you tell us where in those claims?

8 MR. MATTHEWS: I could. There's no recitation with respect to the  
9 threads as there is in the prior art, that the threads are accepting load. The  
10 only recitation of load is with respect to the shoulder ends.

11 JUDGE PATE: So the claims are silent with respect to load on the  
12 threads?

13 MR. MATTHEWS: Well, for example, claim one -- the second page  
14 of claim one, that's section four, the second page -- you'll see that it says,  
15 "Wherein the nose face of the male end engages the internal annular  
16 shoulder of the female end and the nose face of the female end engages the  
17 external annular shoulder of the male end such that compressive loads on the  
18 male end and the female end are borne substantially by the shoulders."

19 JUDGE BAHR: What does "substantially" mean?

20 MR. MATTHEWS: In my opinion, "substantially" means that the  
21 threads don't have any load. The threads on this device -- And that's set  
22 forth in those claims, I think. That's why you have that recitation of  
23 compressive load for the shoulder, is because these threads do not have  
24 compressive load. Whereas the prior art states just the opposite.

25 At this point, do you have any questions? I know you  
26 guys -- What? This is your third hearing today.

1           You will note that Wood is used as a reference for all of the claims.  
2       Wood is item six in your book. And Wood has a mortise-and-tendon  
3       disclosure that is not load bearing. As a matter of fact, you'll notice that the  
4       tendon doesn't touch the bottom of the mortise. It may touch the side walls,  
5       but there's a specific recitation of a space between the mortise and the  
6       tendon. Actually, what happens is, this thing is for a drill string.

7           JUDGE PATE: Sure.

8           MR. MATTHEWS: Okay? So you have drilling mud get in there and  
9       you won't be able to wash it out. That's the reason they have the gap.

10          The Wilson patent is circumferentially spaced threads, no double  
11       shoulder, no driving, no compressive loads on the shoulder.

12          JUDGE BAHR: Why do you say there is no double shoulder in  
13       Wilson?

14          MR. MATTHEWS: Well, there's a drill string -- Hold on. Oh, well,  
15       do you know what? You may be --

16          JUDGE BAHR: Aren't 24 and 25 shoulders?

17          MR. MATTHEWS: I don't see the shoulders. I see the ends, but  
18       there is no shoulder -- no shoulder that restrains outward radial movement.  
19       So what happens when you drive on this thing with the compressive forces,  
20       the ends are forced out. So the reason you see recitation of the claims to  
21       prevent outward radial movement is because that's what happens, is the ends  
22       deform, quite frankly. And so you prevent outward radial expansion.  
23       Wilson, on the other hand, I don't see a shoulder, actually. I see an end.

24          JUDGE BAHR: Item 24 and Item 25 are both referred to as shoulders  
25       in Wilson.



1 MR. MATTHEWS: Okay. The beveled surface -- I think they're  
2 complementary beveled surfaces that don't have the ability to restrain radial  
3 movement.

4 JUDGE BAHR: I don't think the examiner is --

5 MR. MATTHEWS: That's what I'm saying.

6 JUDGE BAHR: I think he would agree with you on that.

7 MR. MATTHEWS: Okay. Well, I don't know. You will notice that  
8 Wilson does have one continuous thread. I believe the disclosure here is that  
9 Wilson is beveled so the shoulder won't accept a load. And the reason  
10 Wilson is beveled is because if it's beveled it won't accept a load. Period.

11 The patent to Kamp obviously is not casing; no recitation of driving  
12 on it. It's got a stop mechanism. In other words, it will not enable you to  
13 fully make up the connection. It's got a stop.

14 So does McCaskill, which is the last patent that's got a stop. It won't  
15 enable it to be fully made up. McCaskill has actually a sub-C connection  
16 with a remote device that you can unlatch the pipe. But McCaskill, if you'll  
17 notice, is actually an insert that's welded into each end of the casing. In  
18 other words, welded here, welded here, welded here, and a quick connect  
19 across here (indicates), but it's got a latch and release and a stop.

20 Well, this pipe is for fully making up. It doesn't have a stop. But  
21 McCaskill and Wilson both disclose they have stops. They can't be fully  
22 made up. And then again, this has the remote release. And actually, it  
23 would be inches away, what the claim is with respect to the Mosing  
24 application.

25 JUDGE PATE: So McCaskill is a riser pipe, right?

26 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, sir.

1 JUDGE PATE: Okay.

2 MR. MATTHEWS: If you'll read it, really it's used offshore.

3 Because what they want to do --

4 JUDGE PATE: Yes, we're familiar with it.

5 MR. MATTHEWS: Okay. But they don't remove that joint. Okay?

6 That casing is permanent. This type of pipe, or this type of claim language  
7 is for something that's not releasable. Once it's there, it's there.

8 And I will not take up any more of your time. If you have any more  
9 questions, I'd be happy to entertain them.

10 JUDGE PATE: Do we have any questions?

11 JUDGE FISCHETTI: No questions.

12 JUDGE BAHR: I have one question. In the last paragraph of claim  
13 one, the language reads, "At least one and/or both of said first and second  
14 protuberances embodies at least one interference dimension --"

15 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, ma'am.

16 JUDGE BAHR: "-- that causes the protuberance to displace a mating  
17 protuberance surface." Are we talking about deformation of the threads  
18 there?

19 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, ma'am.

20 JUDGE BAHR: Okay. So "displace" really means you mean it in the  
21 sense of deforming?

22 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes. You have interfering threads which, one,  
23 the crest infringes -- Both crests infringe -- Both crests are up against one  
24 another substantially, such that there is some type or slight deformation.

25 JUDGE BAHR: Okay.

26 MR. MATTHEWS: Okay, guys. Thank you so much.

1 JUDGE PATE: Okay. Do you have a business card for the court  
2 reporter?

3 MR. MATTHEWS: I do.

4 JUDGE PATE: Just for the record, we should introduce your two  
5 guests, too.

6 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes. Jason Celaya, with our firm, and Dr. Al  
7 Payne, with our firm.

8 JUDGE PATE: Did you get the spellings of them?

9 COURT REPORTER: Yes.

10 MR. MATTHEWS: And by the way, here is a cutaway of the real  
11 deal; which is really fascinating. You can have it. It's 40 inches in diameter;  
12 30-foot long. And Lord knows how much that weighs. Lord knows how  
13 much it takes to drive it down. And rather than taking four hours, you can  
14 do that (indicates); drive on top of it, and not score those threads. So it's  
15 very unusual.

16 JUDGE BAHR: Will it lower the price of oil?

17 MR. MATTHEWS: I'm not sure if the price of oil has anything to do  
18 with this. I think we're being manipulated a little bit on that.

19 By the way, in your notebooks, it shows what you do here. You align,  
20 mate, turn and lock (indicates). That's interesting; isn't it? The same thing.

21 DR. PAYNE: Here's an actual piece, if you'd like to see the  
22 shoulders.

23 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, do you want to see what the shoulders look  
24 like?

1 DR. PAYNE: This is an actual piece that shows the way the  
2 shoulders engage and keep it from expanding radially. And you can pull  
3 that apart (indicates).

4 JUDGE PATE: I'm good.

5 MR. MATTHEWS: All right. Thank you so much.

6 JUDGE PATE: You're very welcome, sir.

7 (Whereupon, at 1:58 p.m., the hearing was concluded.)